

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 21-03027-01-CR-S-RK
)	
TAYLOR,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

On June 1, 2022, a status conference was held, at which the undersigned took up several pending motions to proceed *pro se* filed by Defendant. (Doc. 83.) After discussing her rights with the undersigned, Defendant stated that she was withdrawing her request to proceed *pro se* and wished to remain represented by appointed counsel, Michelle Law. *Id.* As a result, by Order entered June 2, 2022, Defendant's pending motions to proceed *pro se* were deemed withdrawn. (Doc. 84.) Additionally, Defendant's other pending *pro se* motions for various forms of relief were found to be moot, as the Court does not consider *pro se* motions filed by represented parties. *Id.*

After the June 1 status conference, Defendant personally filed four more motions between June 9, 2022 and June 23, 2022. (Docs. 85, 87, 89, 90.) In the four new motions, Defendant reasserts the request to proceed *pro se*, along with requests to dismiss the indictment and to change venue.

Accordingly, the undersigned conducted another status conference on June 27, 2022. (Doc. 91.) At the June 27 status conference, the undersigned once again discussed Defendant's rights with her. After a lengthy discussion, Defendant again decided to withdraw her request to proceed *pro se*.

As a result, Defendant is and remains represented by appointed counsel.¹ And, as the undersigned has advised previously, the Court will not consider *pro se* motions filed by a represented party. Accordingly, the remainder of the relief requested by Defendant in her four *pro se* motions is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ David P. Rush

DAVID P. RUSH

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATE: June 28, 2022

¹ At the June 27 hearing, Michelle Law orally moved for and was granted leave to withdraw as counsel. (Doc. 91.) Following the hearing, attorney Kristin Jones was appointed to represent Defendant in this case. (Doc. 92.)